

## Durham Research Online

---

### Deposited in DRO:

30 August 2012

### Version of attached file:

Accepted Version

### Peer-review status of attached file:

Peer-reviewed

### Citation for published item:

Barton, R. A. and Capellini, I. (2011) 'Maternal investment, life histories and the costs of brain growth in mammals.', *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America.*, 108 (15). pp. 6169-6174.

### Further information on publisher's website:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1019140108>

### Publisher's copyright statement:

### Additional information:

---

### Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in DRO
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full DRO policy](#) for further details.

1 Classification: BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES (Evolution)

2

3 Title: Brain size, life histories and maternal investment in  
4 eutherian mammals

5

6

7

8 Authors: Robert A. Barton<sup>1</sup> & Isabella Capellini<sup>1,2</sup>

9

10 <sup>1</sup>. Evolutionary Anthropology Research Group,  
11 Department of Anthropology, Durham University,  
12 Dawson Building, South Road, Durham, DH1 3LE, U. K.

13 <sup>2</sup>. Present address: School of Biological Sciences,  
14 Queen's University of Belfast, 97 Lisburn Road, Belfast  
15 BT7 9BL, U.K.

16

17 Corresponding author: Robert Barton

18 [r.a.barton@durham.ac.uk](mailto:r.a.barton@durham.ac.uk)

19 Evolutionary Anthropology Research Group,

20 Department of Anthropology, Durham University,

21 Dawson Building, South Road, Durham, DH1 3LE, U. K.

22

## **Abstract**

Brain size variation in mammals correlates with life histories: larger-brained species have longer gestations, mature later and have increased lifespans. These patterns have been explained in terms of both developmental costs (larger brains take longer to grow) and cognitive benefits (large brains enhance survival and increase lifespan). In support of the developmental cost hypothesis, we show that evolutionary changes in pre- and post-natal brain growth correlate specifically with duration of the relevant phases of maternal investment (gestation and lactation respectively). We also find support for the hypothesis that the rate of fetal brain growth is related to the energy turnover of the mother. In contrast, we find no support for hypotheses proposing that costs are accommodated through direct trade-offs between brain and body growth, or between brain growth and litter size. Once the duration of maternal investment is taken into account, adult brain size is uncorrelated with other life history traits such as lifespan. Hence, the general pattern of slower life histories in large-brained species appears to be a direct consequence of developmental costs.

40 \body

41 Brain size varies extensively between species. Many comparative studies have been  
 42 aimed at understanding how and why such variation evolved, and have identified a  
 43 range of factors associated with the evolution of large brains. One general factor  
 44 robustly correlated with brain size is life history; larger-brained species, such as  
 45 humans, develop slowly, have extended periods of juvenility and long lifespans,  
 46 effects that remain after accounting for differences in body size<sup>1-8</sup>. These  
 47 associations have been interpreted in two different ways. First, life history  
 48 correlates could reflect the benefits of large brains in providing a “cognitive buffer”  
 49 against environmental unpredictability, improving survival and permitting long  
 50 lives<sup>2,6-7</sup>. Second, selection on brain size might have secondary consequences for life  
 51 history because larger brains impose a developmental cost, in terms of a need for  
 52 extended growth and maturation<sup>3-5,8</sup>.

53       Because large brains must have both benefits and costs, the two types of  
 54 explanation for the association between brain size and life history are not  
 55 necessarily incompatible<sup>3-7</sup>. They do, however, make different predictions. The  
 56 cognitive buffer hypothesis predicts correlations between brain size, survival and  
 57 lifespan<sup>6-7</sup>. Developmental costs hypotheses on the other hand, assume that brain  
 58 growth has to be traded off against aspects of production, including growth,  
 59 maturation time and reproductive rates, causing larger-brained species to grow and  
 60 mature more slowly and to have lower fertility<sup>4-5,8-10</sup>. This idea overlaps with the  
 61 ‘Maternal Energy Hypothesis’, which suggests that maternal investment and energy

availability constrain the development of large brains, predicting that brain size correlates with the duration of maternal investment and with maternal basal metabolic rate (BMR)<sup>11-12</sup>. Recent comparative evidence is consistent with both cognitive buffer and developmental cost ideas; brain size variation in adult mammals is positively correlated with lifespan<sup>6-7</sup> as well as with the durations of gestation, lactation and the juvenile period<sup>4-5,8,13-14</sup>.

Little attempt has so far been made to distinguish between the effects of these different developmental and life history traits, making individual correlations with brain size difficult to interpret. In particular, it is unknown, whether maternal investment and lifespan are both independently associated with brain size, or whether life history correlations are driven primarily by one of these factors. Furthermore, most studies focus on correlates of adult brain size, which can provide only indirect evidence for developmental costs. A critical and more direct test is whether brain growth during specific phases of development correlates with the relevant aspects of maternal investment and maturation time. Evidence on this question is limited. Some studies have demonstrated a positive correlation between neonate brain size and gestation length, but these were conducted either before the advent of powerful phylogenetic comparative methods<sup>5-16</sup>, or on small samples of primate species<sup>10,17</sup>. Studies of postnatal brain growth have also been limited to small samples of primates, and do not support the critical prediction of an association between postnatal brain growth and lactation<sup>10,17</sup>, a finding in tension with the result that adult brain size correlates with lactation duration in a wider range of mammals<sup>5</sup>. Similarly, although recent studies find that adult brain size

correlates with BMR<sup>8,13</sup>, evidence that this reflects maternal metabolic constraints on either pre- or postnatal brain growth is lacking<sup>16</sup>.

Indeed, it is not even clear how variability in pre- and postnatal brain growth combine to influence variation in adult brain size. The relative amounts of pre- and postnatal brain growth differ significantly between species<sup>17</sup>, and analysis of the genetic correlates of brain size evolution suggests that the two phases of brain growth are genetically dissociable<sup>18</sup>. Hence, they could in principle make independent contributions to species differences in adult brain size. However, it has been suggested that the relative brain sizes of neonates and adults are uncorrelated in mammals<sup>8,10,19</sup>, implying that pre- and postnatal brain growth are traded off. If true, this would suggest that differences in prenatal maternal investment have no impact on adult brain size. On the other hand, recent evidence suggests that neonate and adult brain size are positively correlated in precocial species, but not in altricial species<sup>5,20</sup>. Thus, the question of what developmental mechanisms underpin the evolution of differences in brain size requires further investigation. Given that different neuro-developmental processes are concentrated in different phases<sup>21</sup>, and that opportunities for environmental input occur principally after birth, determining the developmental mechanisms of brain size evolution is likely to be important for understanding its neuroanatomical and functional consequences.

Here we use phylogenetic comparative methods to examine the developmental mechanisms underlying mammalian brain size evolution, and comprehensively test predictions of the developmental costs hypothesis.

Specifically, we examine the contributions of both pre- and postnatal growth to variation in adult brain size, and test the prediction that these phases correlate specifically with gestation and lactation duration respectively, even after controlling for other reproductive and life history variables. We also test whether costs are accommodated through trade-offs between brain and body growth, or between brain size and litter size, and we evaluate at which stage if any maternal metabolic rate is related to brain growth. We evaluate the relative statistical power of developmental costs and cognitive buffer hypotheses as explanations for correlations between brain size and life history, by testing whether brain size is independently associated with maternal investment and other life history variables, such as lifespan. To these ends, we use phylogenetic generalized linear models (PGLM) to test for correlated evolution among traits. We explore the effects of specific variables on the explanatory power of the models by statistically comparing models with versus without the variables in question, using the log-likelihood ratio (LR) test (see Methods).

## Results

**Pre- and post-natal contributions to adult brain size.** Adult and neonate brain size are positively correlated, controlling for both adult and neonate body mass (Figure 1 and Table 1). Additionally controlling for gestation length effectively turns neonate brain size into a rate of relative brain growth (i.e. tests whether adult brain size increases with the amount of prenatal brain growth relative to prenatal body

growth and the amount of time *in utero*); when this is done, adult brain size is significantly positively correlated with neonate brain size ( $t_{117}=5.54$ ,  $p<0.001$ ). Neonate body mass was not associated with adult brain size independently of neonate brain size: adding neonate mass to the predictors did not improve the model fit (model 1 versus model 2 in Table 1;  $LR_1=1.8$ ,  $p>0.05$ ), and neonate body mass correlates with adult brain size only when neonate brain size is excluded from the model ( $t_{118}=3.71$ ,  $n=122$ ,  $p<0.001$ ). The addition of post-natal brain growth, however, significantly improves the fit of the initial model (model 1 versus model 3 in Table 1;  $LR_1=269.9$ ,  $p<0.001$ , increase in  $R^2$  from 0.92 to 0.99). The effect sizes (as estimated by t-values in model 3) suggest that postnatal brain growth may be a stronger predictor of adult brain size, and running the initial model with postnatal brain growth instead of neonate brain size yields a higher  $R^2$  (0.97). Nevertheless, the likelihood ratio test comparing model 3 to the same model but without neonate brain size is highly significant ( $LR_1=70.89$ ,  $p<0.001$ ). Hence, variation in brain size at birth and in the amount of brain growth postnatally have independent influences on adult brain size.

Neonate brain size and postnatal brain growth are uncorrelated, controlling for neonate body mass and maternal mass ( $t_{119}=1.30$ ,  $p>0.1$ ), further emphasizing the independent contributions of fetal and postnatal growth to adult brain size. There was also no significant interaction between the effects on adult brain size of neonatal brain size and postnatal brain growth when this interaction term was added to model 1 ( $t_{118}=-0.84$ ,  $p>0.1$ ). These results therefore suggest that there is no



trade-off between pre- and postnatal brain growth, and that their effects on adult brain size are additive rather than multiplicative.

**Correlates of neonate brain size.** Accounting for allometric effects (neonate body mass and maternal body mass), neonate brain size is positively associated with gestation length (Table 2, model 1). Adding litter size to the predictors in model 1 did not improve the model fit ( $LR_1=1.18$ ,  $p>0.1$ ) and litter size was not significantly associated with neonate brain size (Table 2, model 2). To check that the apparent effect of gestation length is not simply a side-effect of some more general growth or early life-history correlate of brain size, lactation length was added as a predictor to model 1 (reducing sample size to 111): neonate brain size remained significantly associated with gestation length ( $t_{105}=6.14$ ,  $p<0.001$ ) but was unrelated to lactation length ( $t_{105}=0.77$ ,  $p>0.1$ ), and the likelihood ratio test for models with and without lactation was non-significant ( $LR_1=0.6$ ,  $p>0.5$ ). Because the relationship between brain growth and litter size may interact with developmental state (i.e. a trade-off occurs in altricial but not in precocial species<sup>5</sup>), we ran a model with developmental state and the interaction between developmental state and litter size added as predictors. The effects of neonate mass, maternal mass and gestation length remained significant (neonate mass,  $t_{102}=5.34$ ,  $p<0.001$ ; maternal mass,  $t_{102}=3.64$ ,  $p<0.001$ ; gestation length,  $t_{102}=4.91$ ,  $p<0.001$ ), and in addition there was a significant effect of developmental state (precociality is associated with larger brain size;  $t_{102}=2.49$ ,  $p<0.05$ ). However, there was still no main effect of litter size

( $t_{102}=0.11$ ,  $p>0.5$ ), nor a significant interaction between developmental state and litter size, ( $t_{102}=-1.81$ ,  $p>0.05$ ). Note that maternal size was positively associated with neonate brain size in these analyses, even after controlling for other variables, suggesting that larger females produce more encephalized offspring, reiterating the importance of maternal investment. Note also that in all these analyses, neonate brain size increases with neonate body size, hence showing no signs of a trade-off between neural and somatic growth.

We tested for a possible association of BMR with neonatal brain size, controlling for neonate body mass, maternal body mass and gestation length. Gestation length remained a significant predictor of neonate brain size ( $t_{40}=6.41$ ,  $p<0.001$ ) and BMR was also positively correlated with neonate brain size ( $t_{40}=3.07$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). The model including BMR provided a significantly better fit than one omitting it ( $LR_1=7.50$ ,  $p<0.01$ , increase in  $R^2$  from 0.93 to 0.96). BMR remained positively correlated with neonate brain size when controlling for body size using masses of individuals from which the BMR data were obtained instead of species average female body mass ( $t_{40}=3.27$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). With litter size and developmental state, and their interaction, added as predictors in the model, neonate brain size was still significantly positively related to gestation length ( $t_{38}=2.94$ ,  $p<0.01$ ) and BMR ( $t_{39}=2.21$ ,  $p<0.05$ ), but unrelated to litter size ( $t_{38}=-1.03$ ,  $p>0.1$ ), developmental state ( $t_{38}=-0.61$ ,  $p>0.5$ ), and their interaction ( $t_{38}=-0.67$ ,  $p>0.5$ ). Gestation length and BMR were uncorrelated after controlling for female body mass ( $t_{42}=-1.67$ ,  $p>0.1$ ). Hence, these results are consistent with the hypothesis that BMR constrains neonate brain

size directly, via effects on fetal brain growth rate, rather than indirectly, through effects on gestation length<sup>22</sup>.

**Correlates of postnatal brain growth.** The relative amount of postnatal brain growth (controlling for effects of postnatal body growth) is associated with lactation duration (Table 3). Litter size was not significantly related to postnatal brain growth (model 2, table 3). Mirroring the analyses of neonatal brain size, gestation length was added to the predictors to check that the apparent effect is specific to lactation length. Postnatal brain growth remained significantly associated with lactation and was unrelated to gestation length (model 3, Table 3). Similarly, the effect of lactation length remains significant when either age at first reproduction or juvenile period is added as a predictor (models 3 and 4, Table 3), indicating that it is specifically prolongation of lactation, rather than a general slowing of postnatal maturation, that is associated with increased postnatal brain growth. The test comparing model 4 (including juvenile period) to model 1 is non-significant ( $LR_1=3.02$ ,  $p>0.05$ ), reinforcing the lack of an independent effect of juvenile period. The addition of developmental state at birth, litter size and their interaction to the predictors in model 1 (Table 3) revealed no main effects (developmental state,  $t_{89}=-0.30$ ,  $p>0.5$ ; litter size,  $-0.12$ ,  $p>0.5$ ) or interaction ( $t_{89}=-0.09$ ,  $p>0.5$ ). Hence, controlling for allometry, postnatal brain growth is robustly associated with lactation length and not with litter size, developmental state, or juvenile period. As was the case for prenatal development, in all these analyses brain growth is

positively associated with body growth, hence showing no signs of a trade-off between neural and somatic growth.

Although age at first reproduction was unrelated to postnatal brain growth when lactation was in the model, if lactation was removed from the predictors, age at first reproduction became significant ( $t_{92}=2.70$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). This is consistent with the prediction of developmental costs hypotheses that the correlation between large brains and later age at first reproduction is a consequence of prolonged maternal investment. The specific association between brain growth and lactation is further reinforced when a similar model is run for the post-lactation juvenile period, as the latter variable remains non-significant even without lactation in the model ( $t_{92}=1.80$ ,  $p>0.05$ ).

There were no significant associations between postnatal brain growth and milk composition (Table 4; note that the effect of lactation remained significant in this smaller sample). In a smaller subset of the data ( $n=23$ ) for which daily milk energy intake per offspring was available, there was also no significant association between this variable and postnatal brain growth (controlling for lactation and body growth,  $t=-0.28$ ,  $p>0.5$ ). We tried running models with different combinations of milk composition and intake variables, but obtained no significant results (see Table S1 in supplementary information).

Adding BMR to the predictors, postnatal brain growth is significantly positively related to both lactation ( $t_{39}=4.14$ ,  $p<0.001$ ), and BMR ( $t_{39}=2.84$ ,  $p<0.05$ ). However, the association with BMR appears to be driven by *Homo sapiens*, which is

a large outlier in the regression of postnatal brain growth on body size and lactation (residual approximately three standard deviations larger than the mean). When humans were excluded from the analysis, there was no significant relationship between postnatal brain growth and BMR (controlling for size with female body mass,  $t_{38}=1.45$ ,  $p>0.05$ ; controlling for size using BMR sample body mass estimates,  $t_{38}=1.10$ ,  $p>0.05$ ). In addition, even if humans were included, there was no significant association between postnatal brain growth and BMR when BMR sample body masses instead of mean female body mass was used to control for size ( $t_{39}=0.92$ ,  $p>0.1$ ). Postnatal brain growth remained positively associated with lactation in all models. Finally, BMR was not associated with lactation, controlling for either maternal body mass ( $t_{41}=-0.75$ ,  $p>0.5$ ), or BMR sample body masses ( $t_{41}=-0.08$ ,  $p>0.5$ ), ruling out an indirect relationship between BMR and postnatal brain growth mediated by length of lactation.

**Is the association between brain size and life history independent of maternal investment?** Controlling for adult body size, adult brain size is significantly positively associated with age at first reproduction ( $t_{80}=3.02$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). However, inclusion of the duration of maternal investment (gestation+lactation) in the model provides a significantly better fit ( $LR_1=11.52$ ,  $p<0.001$ , increase in  $R^2$  from 0.89 to 0.91). Furthermore, in this improved model, maternal investment is significantly associated with brain size ( $t_{79}=3.53$ ,  $p<0.001$ ), but age at first reproduction is not (age at first reproduction,  $t_{79}=1.58$ ,  $p=0.12$ ). Juvenile period (the interval between

weaning and sexual maturity) is not significantly associated with brain size either with or without maternal investment in the model (with,  $t_{79}=1.30$ ,  $p>0.1$ ; without,  $t_{80}=1.85$ ,  $p>0.05$ ), and again the model including maternal investment provides a better fit than that without ( $LR_1=11.52$ ,  $p<0.001$ ; increase in  $R^2$  from 0.89 to 0.91). Finally, controlling for body size, adult lifespan is positively correlated with brain size ( $t_{80}=2.96$ ,  $p<0.01$ ,  $n=85$ ), but inclusion of the duration of maternal investment in the model provides a significantly better fit ( $LR_1=12.1$ ,  $p<0.001$ , increase in  $R^2$  from 0.89 to 0.91), and in this improved model, maternal investment is significantly correlated with brain size ( $t_{79}=3.52$ ,  $p<0.001$ ) but adult lifespan is not ( $t_{79}=1.32$ ,  $p=0.19$ ).

## Discussion

Our results suggest that larger brains take longer to grow both pre- and postnatally, resulting in prolonged maternal investment. Whilst not ruling out the idea that large brains facilitate enhanced survival and slower, longer lives through a generalized “cognitive buffer” effect, the specificity of the correlations between brain growth and associated phases of maternal investment, together with the fact that postnatal life histories are uncorrelated with adult brain size after taking maternal investment into account, strongly support the argument that life history correlates reflect the developmental costs of large brains<sup>9</sup>. Our results provide support for both the maternal energy hypothesis<sup>11,12</sup> and the broader “expensive brain” hypothesis<sup>5</sup>, although, as predicted by Charnov & Berrigan<sup>9</sup>, some of the

trade-offs reported previously<sup>5</sup> appear to be secondary consequences of the fundamental variable of the rate at which mothers can convert energy into offspring. In particular, neither litter size nor its interaction with developmental state added any explanatory power to the statistical models once gestation, lactation and allometry were accounted for. We conclude that brain growth is primarily related to the duration and rate of maternal investment, with the apparent trade-off with litter size, and differences in correlates between altricial and precocial species, being secondary consequences of variability in gestation and lactation. We did however find that precocial species give birth to larger-brained offspring even after controlling for body size and gestation length. This indicates that the rate, as well as the duration, of fetal brain growth is increased in precocial compared to altricial species, and suggests that the state of the offspring at birth is not entirely determined by the length of gestation.

We found no evidence of trade-offs between brain growth and body growth either pre- or postnatally, nor between the amount of brain growth pre- versus postnatally. Indeed, relative amounts of pre- and postnatal brain growth are uncorrelated, consistent with independent genetic control of these two phases of brain growth<sup>19</sup> and suggesting that they have additive rather than either multiplicative or mutually compensating effects on adult brain size. These findings raise the important questions for future research of what structural and functional implications follow from evolutionary changes in pre- versus postnatal brain growth, and whether changes in the two different phases are associated with different selection pressures.

Models of life history evolution have tended to assume that organisms vary along a single “slow-fast” continuum, implying that different components of life history such as growth, reproductive rate and lifespan, are tightly interlinked, and thus that ratios between them are invariant across taxa<sup>23-24</sup>. This view has recently been challenged on both theoretical and empirical grounds<sup>25-26</sup>. Empirically, dissection of mammalian life history variation using phylogenetic factor analyses identified two distinct dimensions<sup>25</sup>. The first loads heavily on gestation length, neonate size and – though less consistently - on litter size. The second factor loads heavily on inter-birth interval, age at weaning and age at sexual maturity. Our results suggest that brain size may be a key consideration in understanding how such life history traits evolved, and we note that the two factors identified<sup>25</sup> correspond broadly to pre- and postnatal influences on brain growth respectively. We predict that neonatal brain size would load heavily on the first factor and postnatal brain growth on the second. Although explanations of life history evolution have focused on body size and environmental factors such as mortality, brain size may represent an intrinsic factor whose role has so far been under appreciated<sup>4</sup>.

Our results clarify the long-disputed relationship between brain size and metabolic rates. The maternal energy hypothesis<sup>11,12</sup> suggests that basal metabolic rates constrain maternal investment in brain growth, but direct evidence linking BMR to neonate brain size has been lacking, with the only analysis of those variables finding no relationship<sup>16</sup>. Our analysis shows that neonate brain size correlates positively with BMR after taking phylogeny, allometry and gestation length into



account. Since the correlation is evident when controlling for gestation length, it supports the hypothesis that the metabolic rate of the mother constrains the rate of brain growth in the foetus<sup>12</sup>. The finding is also consistent with the hypothesis that the correlation between brain size and BMR is a placental (but not marsupial) trait “related to the intimate physiological contact between mother and offspring during gestation”<sup>8</sup>. The hypothesis that metabolic rate influences prenatal brain growth through an effect on gestation length<sup>22</sup> was however, not supported; there was no significant correlation between BMR and gestation length after controlling for other factors. The restriction of an effect of BMR to the prenatal period together with the significant effects of other maternal investment variables operating at least partly independently of one another also clarifies why the positive association between BMR and adult brain size is relatively weak<sup>13</sup>.

Although it has been suggested that the structure of the placenta might influence nutrient transfer and hence prenatal brain growth<sup>15,27</sup>, recent comparative studies find no evidence for a specific relationship between placental structure and brain growth<sup>28-29</sup>. ‘Labyrinthine’ placentas, in which maternal and fetal tissues are highly interdigitated, are associated with shorter gestations but no difference in neonate brain or body size, suggesting that fetal growth rates are faster in species with labyrinthine placentas<sup>28</sup>. However, there was no difference in the relative brain size of neonates, indicating that higher growth rates are not targeted specifically at the brain<sup>28</sup>. How higher metabolic rates are translated into additional physiological support for fetal brain growth is thus an important and so far unanswered question.

One possibility is that energy turnover constrains the ability of the mother to supply the fetus with specific nutrients, such as long-chain fatty acids<sup>26</sup>.

Similarly, although relative rates of postnatal brain growth are likely to vary, we were unable to find any relationship between brain growth and milk composition, milk energy value or daily milk energy intake at peak lactation. This finding agrees with the observation that convergent evolution of large brain size and extended postnatal brain growth in humans and capuchin monkeys (*Cebus apella*) has not resulted in convergence in milk composition<sup>30</sup>. However, sample sizes were relatively small in our analyses of milk composition in relation to postnatal brain development, and re-analysis with larger data sets when these become available would be interesting, as would analysis of specific nutrients that may play a role in postnatal brain development.

The issue of evolutionary changes in rate versus duration of brain growth is important for understanding the developmental basis of human brain evolution. Most discussions of this subject assume that large relative brain size in humans was developmentally achieved via an exceptional prolongation of postnatal brain growth, creating enhanced opportunities for environmental input to the developing brain<sup>31-33</sup>. A re-analysis by Vinicuis<sup>34</sup> however shows that the ways in which human brain and body growth patterns depart from those of other primates are more complex than this, including at least three distinct mechanisms: a moderate extension of postnatal brain growth, a derived developmental allometry and a retardation of postnatal body growth. The first mechanism fits the general link

between lactation and postnatal brain growth reported here, and suggests that brain size may be a better predictor of the “natural” weaning age for humans than is body size. Vinicius’ second mechanism<sup>34</sup> suggests a difference in the rate of brain growth between humans and other anthropoids, congruent with our finding that variation in brain growth rates, as well as durations, contribute to adult brain size. As we note above, the physiological mechanisms that co-vary with brain growth rates remain unknown. Finally, Vinicius’ third mechanism<sup>34</sup> implies a trade-off between postnatal brain and body growth; we found no evidence for this as a general pattern among eutherian mammals, so its occurrence in humans must be presumed to be evolutionarily unusual.

In conclusion, our results emphasize the energetic costs of brain development as a driver of associations between brain size and life history in mammals. Whilst large brains undoubtedly confer benefits, we found no support for hypotheses predicated on specific associations between brain size and either juvenile period<sup>35</sup> or adult lifespan<sup>6-7</sup>. It is still possible that large brains operate as “cognitive buffers”, since the selective advantage of slower growing, larger brains may be reduced mortality mediated by cognitive capacities<sup>4,7</sup>. However, the cognitive buffer hypothesis as formulated assumes that such cognitive capacities are ‘domain general’, facilitating survival and long lifespans through increased behavioral flexibility<sup>6</sup>. The lack of a significant association between brain size and adult lifespan after controlling for maternal investment suggests that it is not specifically lifespan and an associated need for flexibility that drives the patterns, undermining the link made between life history correlations of brain size and

domain-general cognitive benefits<sup>6</sup>. Given that brain size evolution in mammals is associated with a variety of specific neural systems and structures<sup>36-38</sup>, domain-specific mechanisms should be given equal consideration in attempts to establish the cognitive benefits that offset the developmental costs of large brains.

## Methods

**Data.** We extracted data from the literature on 128 eutherian mammal species as follows.

(i) Brain and body masses: neonate brain and body mass, adult brain and body mass, maternal (adult female) body mass (all in grams). Postnatal growth (brain or body) was calculated as the difference between adult size and neonate size. (ii) Developmental, maternal investment and life history variables: litter size (number of offspring per litter), developmental state at birth (altricial if eyes closed at birth, versus precocial if eyes open at birth), duration of gestation (days), duration of lactation (days), milk composition (as % of fats, proteins and sugars) and milk energetic value (as sum of the energy provided by its components, given milk composition; in KJ) both at peak lactation, daily milk energy intake (milk energetic value multiplied by daily milk intake in ml/day at peak lactation; in KJ/day), age at first reproduction (days), lifespan (days). (iii) Basal metabolic rate (BMR, ml O<sub>2</sub>/hour) together with body masses for the animals from which the BMR data were taken (Body mass<sub>BMR</sub>, in g). We used only estimates of BMR that fulfilled the requirements of the protocol described in McNab<sup>39</sup> (measurement in thermoneutral environment, on adult non-reproducing individuals, quietly resting and post-absorptive). Further details of data and sources and the full data set are provided in supplementary information (Text\_S1 and Dataset\_S1).

**Statistical analysis.** We investigated the correlated evolution of brain size, body size, maternal investment and life history variables using phylogenetic generalized linear models (PGLM)<sup>40</sup>, which allowed us to incorporate phylogeny into statistical models<sup>40-42</sup>. In PGLM analysis, regression parameters are found by maximum likelihood (ML) and ‘weighted’ by the variance-covariance matrix that represents the phylogenetic relationships among the species. In each regression the phylogenetic signal is estimated as the value of  $\lambda$  of the residuals, varying between 0 (where the data have no phylogenetic structure) and 1 (where the best fit to the data is provided by a ‘Brownian Motion’ model of trait evolution<sup>43</sup>, with variation at the tips proportional to the duration of common evolution<sup>42,44</sup>). We report  $\lambda$  values tests for significant departure from either 0 or 1 for each analysis. The estimated ML value of  $\lambda$  is incorporated as a parameter in the model, thus controlling for phylogenetic dependence in the data. Incorporating a discrete binary trait, such as developmental state, as a predictor in regression models amounts to a phylogenetic ANCOVA. In the PGLM framework, more complex models can be compared to simpler models to investigate whether incorporating additional variables of interest provides a better fit to the data. Our tables of results indicate which variables were included in each model, significance tests for these variables, and overall model parameters: values of  $\lambda$ , r-squared values and log-likelihood scores. Alternative nested models are compared using the likelihood ratio (LR) test (where  $LR = -2[\log\text{-likelihood}(\text{better fitting model}) - \log\text{-likelihood}(\text{worse fitting model})]$ ), the best fitting model having the highest log-likelihood score) whose significance is evaluated against a  $\chi^2$  distribution with degrees of freedom corresponding to the difference in the number of parameters between the two competing models<sup>40,44</sup>. All statistical tests were 2-tailed with  $\alpha$ -level of significance set at 0.05. These analyses were carried out using the CAIC R package (R v.2.11.1, The R Foundation for Statistical Computing, <http://www.R-project.org>), available from <http://r-forge.r-project.org/projects/caic>. The phylogeny

(including branch lengths) for the species in our dataset was extracted from a published  
supertree of mammals<sup>45-46</sup>

Continuous variables were  $\log_{10}$ -transformed to improve normality, with the  
exception of milk composition (%) data which were square-rooted and then arcsine-  
transformed<sup>47</sup>. Because, brain mass can be a substantial proportion of overall body mass in  
neonates analyses of these variables could potentially be influenced by autocorrelation and  
consequent issues of collinearity. Likewise, age at first reproduction includes the period of  
lactation and lifespan includes the period up to age at first reproduction. We therefore ran  
analyses based on non-overlapping measures [neonate body mass with brain mass  
subtracted, age at first reproduction with lactation subtracted (=juvenile period), and  
lifespan with age at first reproduction subtracted (=adult lifespan]. We do include some  
analyses in which age at first reproduction and lactation appear as predictors in the same  
model for comparability with other studies that use this variable, whilst noting the issue of  
autocorrelation. Bivariate plots and residuals were examined to check for violation of  
homogeneity of variance. We checked for the effects of outliers by re-running analyses after  
deleting data points generating large residuals (greater than the mean by three standard  
deviations or more). However, removing outliers qualitatively affected conclusions in only  
one case. This outlier was caused by a data point for humans. Because humans are  
particularly large brained they potentially exert high leverage on regressions; hence we re-  
ran analyses with and without humans, but the outcome was affected in just the one case  
mentioned above, so we report results including humans unless otherwise stated.

## Acknowledgements

We thank Natalie Cooper and Laura Fortunato for help with software. The comments of two anonymous referees, colleagues within the Evolutionary Anthropology Research Group and Professor Bob Elwood helped us to improve the manuscript. The data analysis benefited from RBs participation in the AnthroTree workshop, University of Massachusetts in Amherst, June 2010, organized by Charlie Nunn. This work was funded by a BBSRC/NERC project grant (number BB/E014593/1).

## References

1. Sacher GA (1959) in *The lifespan of animals. CIBA Foundation colloquium on ageing*, eds Wolstenholme GEW, O'Connor M, (Little, Brown Boston), pp 115-133.
2. Allman JM, McLaughlin T, Hakeem A (1993) Brain weight and life-span in primate species. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 90: 118-122.
3. de Leon MSP et al. (2008) Neanderthal brain size at birth provides insights into the evolution of human life history. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 105: 13764-13768.
4. Isler K, van Schaik CP (2008) Why are there so few smart mammals (but so many smart birds)? *Biol Lett* 5: 125-129.
5. Isler K, van Schaik CP (2009) The expensive brain: a framework for explaining evolutionary changes in brain size. *J Hum Evol* 57:392-400.
6. Sol D (2009) Revisiting the cognitive buffer hypothesis for the evolution of large brains. *Biol Lett* 5:130-133.

7. Gonzalez-Lagos C, Sol D, Reader SM (2010) Large-brained mammals live longer. *J Evol Biol* 23:1064-1074.
8. Weisbecker V, Goswami A (2010) Brain size, life history, and metabolism at the marsupial/placental dichotomy. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 107:16216-16221.
9. Charnov EL, Berrigan D (1993) Why do female primates have such long lifespans and so few babies? Or life in the slow lane. *Evol Anth* 1:191-194.
10. Barrickman NL, Bastian ML, Isler K, van Schaik CP (2008) Life history costs and benefits of encephalization: a comparative test using data from long-term studies of primates in the wild. *J Hum Evol* 54:568-590.
11. Martin RD (1981) Relative brain size and metabolic rate in terrestrial vertebrates. *Nature* 293:57-60.
12. Martin RD (1996) Scaling of the mammalian brain: the maternal energy hypothesis. *News Physiol Sci* 11:149-156.
13. Isler K, van Schaik CP (2006) Metabolic costs of brain size evolution. *Biol Lett* 2:557-560.
14. Jones KE, MacLarnon AM (2004) Affording larger brains: Testing hypotheses of mammalian brain evolution on bats. *Am Nat* 164:E20-E31.
15. Sacher GA, Staffeldt EF (1974) Relation of gestation time to brain weight for placental mammals: implications for the theory of vertebrate growth. *Am Nat* 108:593-612.
16. Pagel M, Harvey P (1988) How mammals produce large-brained offspring. *Evolution* 42:948-957.
17. Leigh SR (2004) Brain growth, life history, and cognition in primate and human



- 512 evolution. *Am J Primatol* 62:139-164.
- 513 18. Montgomery SH, Capellini I, Venditti C, Barton RA, Mundy NI (2011) Adaptive  
514 evolution of microcephaly genes and brain size in mammals. *Mol Biol & Evol.* 28:  
515 625-638.
- 516 19. Harvey PH, Krebs JR (1990) Comparing brains. *Science* 249:140-146.
- 517 20. DeSilva JM, Lesnik JJ (2008) Brain size at birth throughout human evolution: A  
518 new method for estimating neonatal brain size in hominins. *J Hum Evol* 55: 1064–  
519 1074.
- 520 21. Stiles J (2008) Fundamentals of Brain Development: Integrating Nature and  
521 Nurture, (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- 522 22. Hofman MA (1983) Evolution of brain size in neonatal and adult placental  
523 mammals - A theoretical approach. *J Theor Biol* 105:317-332.
- 524 23. Charnov EL (1991) Evolution of life-history variation among female mammals.  
525 *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 88:1134-1137.
- 526 24. Kozłowski J, Weiner J (1997). Interspecific allometries are by- products of body  
527 size optimization. *Am Nat* 149:352– 380.
- 528 25. Nee S, Colegrave N, West SA, Grafen A (2005) The illusion of invariant  
529 quantities in life histories. *Science* 309:1236-1239.
- 530 26. Bielby J et al. (2007) The fast-slow continuum in mammalian life history: an  
531 empirical evaluation. *Am Nat* 169:748-757.
- 532 27. Elliot MG, Crespi BJ (2008) Placental invasiveness and brain-body allometry in  
533 eutherian mammals. *J Evol Biol* 21:1763-1778.
- 534 28. Capellini I, Venditti C, Barton RA (2011) Placentation and maternal investment in

- mammals. *Am Nat* 177:86-98.
29. Martin, R.D. (2008) Evolution of placentation in primates: Implications of mammalian phylogeny. *Evol Biol* 35:125-145.
30. Milligan LA (2010) Milk Composition of Captive Tufted Capuchins (*Cebus apella*). *Am J Primatol* 72:81-86.
31. Count EW (1947) Brain and body weight in man: their antecedents in growth and evolution. *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.* 46, 993-1122
32. Martin RD (2007) The Evolution of Human Reproduction: A Primatological Perspective. *Yrbk Phys Anth* 50: 59-84.
33. Humphrey LT (2010) Weaning behaviour in human evolution. *Semin Cell Dev Biol* 21:453-461.
34. Vinicius L (2005) Human encephalization and developmental timing. *J Hum Evol* 49:762-776.
35. Joffe TH (1997) Social pressures have selected for an extended juvenile period in primates. *J Hum Evol* 32: 593-605.
36. Barton RA (1998) Visual specialization and brain evolution in primates. *Proc Roy Soc (B)* 265: 1933-1937.
37. Barton RA, Harvey PA (2000) Mosaic evolution of brain structure in mammals. *Nature* 405:1055-1057.
38. Healy SD Rowe C (2006) A critique of comparative studies of brain size. *Proc R Soc, Lond B* 274:453-464.
39. McNab BK (1997) On the utility of uniformity in the definition of basal rate of metabolism. *Physiol Zool* 70:718-720.

40. Pagel M (1999) The maximum likelihood approach to reconstructing ancestral character states of discrete characters on phylogenies. *Syst Biol* 48:612-622.
41. Rohlf FJ (2001) Comparative methods for the analysis of continuous variables: Geometric interpretations. *Evolution* 55:2143-2160.
42. Freckleton, RP, Harvey PH, Pagel M (2002) Phylogenetic analysis and comparative data: a test and review of evidence. *Am Nat* 160:712-726.
43. Felsenstein J (1985) Phylogenies and the comparative method. *Am Nat* 125:1-15.
44. Pagel M (1997) Inferring evolutionary processes from phylogenies. *Zool Scripta* 26:331-348.
45. Bininda-Emonds ORP et al. (2007) The delayed rise of present-day mammals. *Nature* 446:507-512.
46. Bininda-Emonds ORP et al. (2008) The delayed rise of present-day mammals. Corrigendum. *Nature* 456:274.
47. Quinn GP, Keough MJ (2002) *Experimental design and data analysis for biologists*, (Cambridge Univ Press, Cambridge, UK).

574 **Figure legends**

575 Figure 1. Association between relative brain size of neonate and adult mammals.  
 576 Encephalization scores are the residuals from phylogenetic generalized linear  
 577 models for brain size on the appropriate body size (either neonate or adult). See  
 578 Table 1 for results of statistical analysis.

579

580 **Table legends**

581 Table 1. PGLM analysis of pre- and postnatal contributions to adult brain size,  
 582 controlling for body size. Variables not included in a particular model are indicated  
 583 by blank entries in the Table. Significant predictors of adult brain size indicated in  
 584 bold type. Lh=maximized log-likelihood,  $\lambda$ =estimated ML value of lambda  
 585 (phylogenetic signal) which is included as a parameter in the models, with p-values  
 586 for tests of statistical difference from a model with no phylogenetic signal ( $p(\lambda=0)$   
 587 and a model with  $\lambda=1$  ( $p(\lambda=1)$ ).

588 Table 2. PGLM analysis of neonate brain size. Significant predictors of neonate brain  
 589 size indicated in bold type. Other details as for Table 1.

590 Table 3. PGLM analysis of postnatal brain growth. Significant predictors of postnatal  
 591 brain growth indicated in bold type. Other details as for Table 1.

592 Table 4. PGLM analysis of postnatal brain growth, lactation and milk composition.  
593 Significant predictors of postnatal brain growth indicated in bold type. Other details  
594 as for Table 1.

Table 1.

Model (n=122)	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Parameter	t, p-value	t, p-value	t, p-value
Intercept	-3.1, <0.01	-2.88, <0.01	4.75, <0.001
Neonatal brain size	<b>6.82, &lt;0.001</b>	<b>6.07, &lt;0.001</b>	<b>17.12, &lt;0.001</b>
Adult body size	<b>9.61, &lt;0.001</b>	<b>8.77, &lt;0.001</b>	<b>3.95, &lt;0.001</b>
Neonatal body mass	-	-1.54, 0.13	-
Postnatal brain growth	-	-	<b>31.2, &lt;0.001</b>
$\lambda$	0.79	0.74	0.70
$p(\lambda=0)$	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
$p(\lambda=1)$	<0.001	<0.01	<0.001
Model summary			
Lh	55.39	56.29	190.35
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.917	0.923	0.991

Table 2.

Model (n=128)	Model 1	Model 2
Parameter	t, p-value	t, p-value
Intercept	-2.60, <0.001	-2.49, <0.001
Neonatal body mass	<b>6.05, &lt;0.001</b>	<b>6.00, &lt;0.001</b>
Maternal body size	<b>3.13, &lt;0.01</b>	<b>3.25, &lt;0.01</b>
Gestation length	<b>7.20, &lt;0.01</b>	<b>6.38, &lt;0.001</b>
Litter size	-	-1.14, >0.1
$\lambda$	0.90	0.90
$p(\lambda=0)$	<0.001	<0.001
$p(\lambda=1)$	<0.01	<0.01
Model summary		
Lh	58.06	58.65
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.92	0.92

Table 3.

Model (n=96)	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Parameter	t, p-value	t, p-value	t, p-value	t, p-value	t, p-value
Intercept	-8.41, <0.001	-8.13, <0.001	-5.56, <0.001	-8.54, <0.001	-9.64, <0.001
Postnatal body growth	<b>17.60, &lt;0.001</b>	<b>17.47, &lt;0.001</b>	<b>13.89, &lt;0.001</b>	<b>14.13, &lt;0.001</b>	<b>14.67, &lt;0.001</b>
Lactation	<b>3.83, &lt;0.001</b>	<b>3.78, &lt;0.001</b>	<b>3.75, &lt;0.001</b>	<b>3.06, &lt;0.01</b>	<b>3.80, &lt;0.001</b>
Litter size	-	0.18, >0.5	-	-	-
Gestation	-	-	-0.05, p>0.5	-	-
Age at first reproduction	-	-	-	1.69, >0.1	-
Juvenile period	-	-	-	-	1.82, >0.05
$\lambda$	0.67	0.67	0.67	0.60	0.57
p( $\lambda=0$ )	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	>0.05	>0.1
p( $\lambda=1$ )	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Model summary					
Lh	1.01	1.03	1.01	2.38	2.52
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.86	0.87



Table 4.

Model (n=48)	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Parameter	t, p-value	t, p-value	t, p-value	t, p-value	t, p-value
Intercept	-6.94, <0.001	-8.28, <0.001	-6.25, <0.001	-7.28, <0.001	-7.42, <0.001
Postnatal body growth	<b>13.87, &lt;0.001</b>	<b>13.65, &lt;0.001</b>	<b>15.02, &lt;0.001</b>	<b>14.09, &lt;0.001</b>	<b>14.56, &lt;0.001</b>
Lactation	<b>4.20, &lt;0.001</b>	<b>4.19, &lt;0.001</b>	<b>4.19, &lt;0.001</b>	<b>4.17, &lt;0.001</b>	<b>4.31, &lt;0.001</b>
% dry matter	0.81, >0.1	-	-	-	-
% fat	-	0.71, >0.1	-	-	-
% protein	-	-	-0.24, >0.5	-	-
% sugar	-	-	-	-0.04, >0.5	-
Milk energy	-	-	-	-	0.66, >0.5
$\lambda$	0.10	0.14	0.25	0.23	0.16
$p(\lambda=0)$	>0.5	>0.5	>0.1	>0.1	>0.5
$p(\lambda=1)$	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Model summary					
Lh	0.55	0.52	0.33	0.30	0.51
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.92	0.92	0.90	0.91	0.91

